

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated June 15, 2006, claims 4-21 were allowed, claim 2 was objected to, claims 1 and 3 were rejected, and claims 22-34 were withdrawn from consideration.

By the present amendment:

1. Claim 2 has been rewritten in independent form, which the Office Action stated would place this claim in condition for allowance. Claim 2 has also been amended to remove a redundancy in the original language of this claim, and to use terminology that has proper antecedent basis.

2. Claims 22-34 have been canceled.

3. Claim 1 has been amended in a manner that is believed to place both claim 1 and its dependent claim 3 in condition for allowance, for reasons to be discussed below.


4. Claim 4 has been amended to correct a spelling error.

The Office Action also required an abstract, which is submitted herewith on a separate sheet.

Original claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 on the basis of the Lawrence patent 5,796,097. Claim 1 has now been amended to add the clause, "said light-absorbing and expanding member expanding in response to light impinging thereon and thereby resulting in displacement of said member." This added clause clearly distinguishes over the Lawrence patent because Lawrence only describes an actuator that obtains its energy for expansion from a chemical reaction rather than from light. The allowance of claims 4-21, as well as claim 2, suggests that the Examiner has already appreciated this distinction between Lawrence and the present applicants' invention. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable as now amended. Claim 3 is dependent on the amended claim 1 and thus should also be allowable.

Dated: September 5, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Stephen G. Rudisill

Registration No.: 20,087
JENKENS & GILCHRIST
225 W. Washington, Ste. 2600
Chicago, Illinois 60606-3418
(312) 425-3900
Attorneys For Applicant